DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 312 896 FL 018 228

AUTHOR Tucker, G. Richard
TITLE Developing a Language Competent American Society: The Role of Language Planning.
INSTITUTION Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 89
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at McGill University Conference on Bilingualism (Montreal, Canada, May 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Needs; *Educational Policy; *Language Planning; *Language Proficiency; Policy Formation; *Public Policy; Second Language Learning

ABSTRACT

Increasingly, applied linguists have been working with counterpart teachers who are subject-matter specialists to develop innovative programs to integrate the teaching of language and content. In some places, integration of language and content instruction involves implementation of two-way bilingual (interlocking) immersion programs. Such work falls into the general rubric of language (education) policy or planning. The role of language in education in several disparate settings is illustrated by the adoption of different policies and practices. In the People's Republic of China, English is taught non-intensively as a foreign language as part of the regular middle school curriculum, followed by more intensive English for special purposes for those with a demonstrable need for further study in English. Nigeria provides transitional bilingual education with a limited maintenance component. The Philippines offers full bilingual education with a complete integration of language and content instruction throughout education cycles. The process by which a country chooses an appropriate model represents educational language planning. This process has relevance for policy formation in the United States. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED312896

Developing a Language Competent American Society: The Role of Language Planning

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Tucker, G.R
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

G. Richard Tucker
Center for Applied Linguistics

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Abstract

In many parts of the world, renewed attention has been directed toward providing the soundest possible education for language minority and for language majority individuals. Increasingly, applied linguists have been working with counterpart teachers who are subject-matter specialists to develop innovative programs to integrate the teaching of language and content. In some places, the logical extension of the integration of language and content instruction involves the implementation of two-way bilingual (or so-called interlocking) immersion programs.

Such work falls within the general rubric of language (education) policy or planning. Thus, when considering the establishment of innovative language education programs there are two threads of literature to be examined -- that dealing with language policy or planning and that dealing with the development and implementation of innovative language education programs. In this paper, I will present information about the role of language in education in several disparate settings -- each of which has adopted different policies and practices.

The first, the People's Republic of China, represents an instance in which English is taught non-intensively as a foreign language as part of the regular middle school curriculum followed by a more intensive English for special purposes approach for those with demonstrable need for English proficiency to undertake further study. The second case, that of Nigeria, represents an instance of transitional bilingual education with a limited maintenance component; while the third, the Philippines, represents an instance of full bilingual education with a complete integration of language and content instruction throughout cycles of education.

I will argue that the process by which one decides upon the choice of an appropriate model represents an instance of (educational) language planning and will discuss its relevance for language educators in the United States.

FL018228

Paper prepared for McGill Conference on Bilingualism: A Tribute to Wallace E. Lambert
May 1989

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Developing a Language-Competent American Society: The Role of Language Planning

G. Richard Tucker
Center for Applied Linguistics

It is perhaps appropriate to begin by noting that there are today many more bilingual individuals in the world than there are monolingual; and that, in addition, many more children throughout the world have been and continue to be educated via a second or a later-acquired language -- at least for some portion of their formal education -- than the number who are educated exclusively via their mother tongue. Thus, in many parts of the world, bilingualism and innovative approaches to education which involve the use of more than one language constitute the status quo, a way of life, a natural experience. The occurrence of bilingualism in many parts of the world is not problematic, burdensome, or difficult.

Educators for at least five millenia have been faced with the necessity of developing innovative educational programs which have often involved some form of bilingual instruction. For example, in 3000 B.C., in ancient Mesopatamia, Sumerian and Akkadian were the two languages used as media of instruction for training scribes. In more contemporary times bilingual education programs have arisen in diverse sociopolitical settings: for example, where a non-native indigenous language of wider communication (e.g., Amharic in Ethiopia; Pilipino in the Philippines; Swahili in Tanzania) is used as a major language of instruction; in situations where large numbers of immigrant children with different native languages enter an otherwise monolingual school system (e.g., Mexican children in the United States); or even where speakers of a nonstandard language variety (e.g., Haitian or Cape Verdean Creole) attend schools where the teachers and texts use a standard, more prestigious form of the language. Programs of innovative language education have been developed in many countries where there is a desire to provide universal, free primary (and often secondary) education; or to regionalize or nationalize educational

systems which were previously controlled by or modeled after those of colonial powers; or to foster a sense of self-esteem, ethnic awareness, or national unity. In some settings, bilingual education programs have been adopted to foster or to maintain equal facility in both languages with a concomitant development of appreciation for the values and traditions of both ethnolinguistic groups, while others use the development of early skills in the child's mother tongue as a bridge leading toward a more effective development of ability in some target language (and do not necessarily try to maintain children's proficiency in the first language). That is, the goals or the objectives of language education programs will be noticeably different in different settings.

(I find it to be an enduring paradox or dilemma of American education that becoming bilingual, bilingualism, or the encouragement of innovative language education programs as a part of the core or basic curriculum within public education is so often viewed as problematic, difficult, or at best undesirable. Rather than viewing bilingual education as a form of cognitively enriching education for the children it is too often viewed as compensatory education.)

Questions regarding educational policy. In my work in different settings throughout the world during the past two decades, I have come to believe that the selection of a language or languages to be taught or to be used for instruction clearly constitutes an important aspect of educational and of national planning. Thus, when considering the establishment of innovative language education programs there are two threads of literature to be examined -- that dealing with language policy or language planning (e.g., Weinstein 1983) and that dealing with the development and implementation of innovative language education (in many places, bilingual education) programs (e.g., Cziko and Troike, 1984; Genesee, 1987; Willig, 1985). A number of questions arise which should be addressed:

1. Does the country (or political unit) have an official language policy -- either de jure or de facto? Does that policy govern the selection of language(s) of instruction in public education?

2. Does the country have complementary or conflicting federal and provincial language policies? (Here the analogy of the Canadian policy versus that of the Province of Quebec comes to mind.)

3. Is the population of the country relatively homogeneous by mother tongue and

ethnic origin? If not, do there exist sizeable ethnolinguistic groups who are cohesive and who have managed to achieve economic or political power? Have any or all of these diverse ethnolinguistic groups been recognized and accorded any special rights or treatment?

4. Does the country have a centrally controlled or administered system of political education? What is the role (obligatory versus optional) of second language teaching in formal education? Is there a national curriculum, a set of nationally prescribed textbooks, standardized examinations?

5. If responsibility for public education rests with the provincial government, does the federal government nonetheless influence educational policy by the way in which it allocates supplemental funding?

6. How specific are the curricular goals that are established in the formal educational system? What standards of achievement in both content area and in language proficiency have been set? What expectations exist concerning the role that parents, peers, and other extracurricular societal resources will play in the lifelong education of the individual? What direct role, if any, do parents play in shaping educational policy? How is accomplishment or competency typically assessed?

7. What research evidence exists to support claims for the differential effectiveness of various pedagogical approaches? (Do remember, however, that language (education) policy is only rarely affected by the results of empirical research.)

These questions may form a framework within which to examine language policy in several disparate settings.

As I mentioned, in many parts of the world renewed attention has been directed toward providing the soundest possible education for language minority and for language majority individuals. We find exciting innovative programs in industralized and in non-industralized countries; we find such programs being implemented to improve the teaching of second or foreign languages for language majority individuals; and we find such programs to enhance the teaching of the national or official language when it is not spoken as the mother tongue by language minority

youngsters. Each represents an instance of language planning: that is, of needs assessment or information collection to establish goals and objectives; deliberation or discussion; policy implementation involving some demonstrable change; and evaluation or provision of formative feedback. In each setting, a major goal is the development of bilingual proficiency for some or for all students.

I believe it is often easier to bring a familiar situation into sharper focus by means of comparison and contrast. Therefore I would like to present briefly information about the role of language in education from three settings -- the People's Republic of China, Nigeria, and the Philippines. Each of these countries has adopted different policies and practices with regard to the role of language in education and I hope that it might be useful to consider the situation in your own area in the light of information about practices in other settings. I have chosen these three examples purposefully. Each represents an instance of language planning, but with a different emphasis. The first, that of the PRC, represents an instance in which English is taught to many as a foreign language and then intensively to a few through a language for specific purposes approach. In the second, Nigeria, there is a transitional bilingual education program for all youngsters with limited maintenance of the mother tongue; while in the third, the Philippines, there is a full integration of language and content instruction and a provision of bilingual eduction during all phases of the formal education cycle. No one model is more or less appropriate for United States education. However, the process by which individuals in these countries have arrived at a program suited to their needs -- that is, through the process of needs assessment, information collection, deliberation, policy implementation, and both formative and summative evaluation with feedback leading to program revision may be generally applicable.

People's Republic of China (PRC). The Mandarin "dialect" of Chinese is the official language of the PRC. Instruction for children at all levels, except in autonomous regions such as Uighur, Inner Mongolia, and Tibet, occurs via Chinese. Children are instructed using Putonghua -- the so-called "common language." Furthermore, they are introduced to literacy training using Pinyin and then gradually bridged into reading with simplified Chinese characters. The country has a national curriculum for primary and middle (our secondary) schools with unified standard

textbooks and a national examination system. There are bureaus of education and higher education in each of the provinces but their major task is to implement national policy. Under the Chinese constitution, the national autonomous regions are guaranteed certain language rights and are encouraged to use the indigenous languages for purposes of primary education, and local government. In effect, there appear to exist transitional bilingual education programs in the various autonomous regions.

Foreign language study in the PRC is compulsory beginning with the third grade of primary school. For the past ten years, English has been the most widely taught foreign language although not the only available language; the goal is that children by the end of middle school will have acquired quite modest (receptive) proficiency in their foreign language. Previously Russian was the most widely taught foreign language, but its popularity has rapidly declined over the last decade.

Several years ago, the Chinese decided, as a matter of public policy that foreign language facility would be an indispensable tool in their pursuit of the "four modernizations." They decided not to rely upon the widespread translation of materials from other languages into Chinese; but rather that the Chinese people should acquire the ability to work effectively in the necessary foreign language(s) -- a policy decision of immense implication for educators because they could have decided to embark on a massive program of technical translation from foreign languages into Chinese. Rather they concluded, for practical purposes, that their citizenry must develop proficiency in English for "access to science and technology." As mentioned previously, English is introduced in primary 3, but the fact remains that students typically achieve only limited proficiency in English by the time that they graduate from middle schools.

Thus, the Chinese have established national resource centers at, among other places, Jao Tung University in Shanghai to facilitate the study and teaching of English for science and technology (EST) -- an instance of language for specific purposes. They have recently approved a national EST curriculum for the tertiary level and are presently developing new texts and training teachers to implement the curriculum. It remains to be seen how successful the Chinese will be, but the notion of providing intensive English language training at higher levels of education to a

restricted group -- that is, only those with demonstrable need and high motivation -- represents a carefully debated and principled policy decision. One finds examples such as this replicated in many parts of the world (for example, in Indonesia, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia to mention only a few). In such instances there is a deliberate policy of introducing a broad spectrum of students to general study of a foreign language for a number of years as a part of the compulsory school curriculum followed by the intensive teaching of that language at higher or tertiary levels to those with a demonstrable need. In addition, in these contexts, it is often the case that the teaching of language is "delinked" from the teaching of culture. This move to teach the language for a variety of technical, occupational or other purposes minus the culture represented by the host group represents a controversial but interesting emerging trend. Let me turn now to quite a different example.

Nigeria. Nigeria is a large, multilingual country situated in central West Africa. English is the official language although a number of Nigerian languages have achieved prominence and are used initially for primary instruction. Prior to independence, virtually all of the limited primary instruction available was provided via English. This was followed by a period in which the mother tongue, particularly if it happened to be one of the major Nigerian languages (such as Yoruba, Hausa, or Igbo), was used as the medium of instruction in the first three primary grades to be replaced by English at primary 4. However, in 1970 an exciting and important educational innovation began which has been referred to as the Yoruba Six-Year Primary Project (see Language in Education in Africa, 1985). In this particular project, Yoruba -- the mother tongue of a majority of the children in what was once called the western state of Nigeria -- is used as the major medium of instruction during all six primary grades. In addition, English is taught as a second language throughout each of the six years.

It is important to note that the Yoruba Six-Year Primary Project involved the development of a new curriculum which was much more closely attuned to the content, values, and traditions of Nigerians than was the previous curriculum which the so-called "Oxbridge" model; the development of a complete new textbook series written in Yoruba for Nigerian children; the development of intensive and effective in-service as well as pre-service teacher training programs

(at the University of Ife) to orient those who would use these materials in the project; and the development of a new, more appropriate ESL program and materials for the primary levels. (It should be noted that project staff initially hoped that ESL would be taught by specialist teachers throughout, but that they soon abandoned this innovation because of the exhorbitant expense.) The aim of the project was to develop and implement an appropriate, integrated and articulated curriculum which was responsive to the needs and interests of Nigerian children while simultaneously developing a set of tools and building blocks in English as a second language for these children so that those who would continue their formal schooling could effectively make a transition between primary 6 and secondary 1 from Yoruba to English as the medium of instruction.

The project involved the identification of carefully selected experimental and control groups of youngsters in both urban and rural areas. Formative and summative evaluations were carried out over a period of several years. At this point a word should be said about the longer-term goals of this educational option for Nigeria. As mentioned, at the secondary level, English becomes the medium of instruction and continues to be used throughout secondary as well as tertiary studies. In addition, however, and of critical importance for educational planners is the fact that a robust Yoruba language arts program continues throughout the secondary level. This language arts program is viewed as an essential and integral part of the total educational offerings for the children. In many ways, this resembles what we refer to in the United States as a "maintenance" approach to bilingual education -- albeit a limited one. In addition, one of the other major Nigerian languages is introduced as a subject for study at the secondary level. Thus, children might add Hausa or Igbo or some other Nigerian language as a subject for study at secondary 1 depending upon where in Yoruba land they happened to live.

Available results indicate that the children participating in this innovative educational program fare very well indeed. In fact, when the crucial comparison is made between experimental and control groups of children at the end of their primary studies as they are about to enter secondary school, it has been found that a significantly higher proportion of children educated via the innovative Yoruba Six-Year Primary Project successfully pass their primary school leaving

examinations and qualify for entrance to secondary school than their carefully selected control counterparts. The youngsters do extremely well on a variety of tests which were developed for assessing the project. In addition, it has been reported that there is a much higher degree of parental involvement in the schooling of these innovatively educated youngsters than for their control counterparts. By all accounts, the program seems to have been a pedagogical success. The participating children are able to undertake study via English. Let us now move to an extremely different -- and equally innovative -- example from the Philippines.

Republic of the Philippines. The Philippines is a multilingual country with approximately 150 mutually unintelligible language spoken throughout an archipelago comprising some 7,000 islands. The country has a long history of thorough, longitudinal evaluation of various educational alternatives (see, for example, Tucker, 1977; Sibayan, 1978). After more than a decade of experimenting with diverse approaches to language education and as a result of a nationwide language policy survey undertaken during 1967 and 1968, policy makers in the Philippines adopted a novel approach to bilingual education in 1974 which involves language by subject matter specificity throughout the primary and secondary levels of education. This policy was adopted in an attempt to maintain the historically high level of English proficiency by Filipino students which helps to facilitate their access to tertiary study in English medium institutions at home and abroad, and to enhance the spread of Pilipino as a language of national unity.

It was decided after much deliberation involving educators and policy makers at the highest level that initial schooling at grades 1 and 2 should be via the child's vernacular language(s) if different from Tagalog (which is the basis for Pilipino) with English and Pilipino being taught as second languages for each of the first two years. The purpose is to introduce the child to basic concepts and initial literacy training in a familiar language and to develop a set of solid "building blocks" in both English and Pilipino so that a transition can be made at grade 3 to these two languages as dual media of instruction for the remainder of the child's formal education. Then, at primary 3 a "double" transition is made for most children with English being used to teach mathematics and various science subjects while Pilipino is used to teach all remaining subjects (e.g., history, geography, etc.). In addition, of course, there continue to be courses in English

language arts and Pilipino language arts throughout. This program of language by subject matter specificity continues from grade 3 through the end of the secondary cycle of education. Recently, the Linguistic Society of the Philippines (1986) conducted a summative evaluation of the impact of the bilingual education program (see also Tucker, 1987). They conducted a nation-wide quantitative and qualitative study to investigate English and Pilipino language proficiency and achievement in mathematics, social science and social studies by approximately 7,500 grade 4, 6, and 10 students and by approximately 1,000 grade 4, 6 and 10 teachers selected from 17 ethnolinguistic regions throughout the country. The results of this study were presented at a special seminar for key decision makers in the Ministry of Education in January 1987 and suggestions were made for "fine tuning" or modifying various aspects of policy and practice.

Findings, in brief, indicated a systematic downtrend in educational achievement from grade 4 to 6 to 10; the teachers were not in many instances masters themselves of the content material which they were called upon to teach; many non-native speaking Pilipino teachers were not themselves proficient in Pilipino; there is scarcity of materials or poor distribution of existing materials and there is little original scholarship in Pilipino which could lead to its further elaboration and cultivation. Participants at the special symposium reaffirmed the goal of developing a bilingual citizenry as being among one of the major tasks of Filipino education; they reaffirmed the desirability of a bilingual by subject matter specialization; they emphasized once again the importance of teaching initial literacy skills and initial content material in the vernacular languages in non-Tagalog areas at grades 1 and 2; they called attention to the special need to prepare teachers more effectively to teach Pilipino as a second language (an irony because such courses are virtually nonexistent in a country which prides itself on the level of preparation of its teachers of English as a Second Language); they called for additional sustained materials development particularly for core and ancillary materials in Pilipino; they called for revitalized preservice and inservice education for teachers with language proficiency in either English or Tagalog being a prerequisite for entering the content strand; they called for the development of a country-wide examination system for students at grade 4, 6 and 10; and they suggested that the present six-year cycle of primary education be expanded to seven years for children from non-Tagalog areas.

In February of 1987, Filipino legislators ratified a new constitution which was endorsed in a public plebiscite which asserted "The state shall protect and promote the right of all citizens to quality education at all levels and shall take appropriate steps to make such education accessible to all." The implementing Department of Education Order in June 1987 continued "The general goal...is to bring about competence in both Pilipino and English at the national level -- the aspiration of the Filipino nation is to have its citizens possess skills in both languages equal to their functions and duties as citizens in Philippine society and equal to the needs of the country in the community of nations." Obviously, Filipinos view bilingual language proficiency as a natural and national resource to be developed to the highest possible degree. The approach which has been chosen by Filipinos to language education policy bears close scrutiny over the next several years to see whether such a program can facilitate the development of full and fluent bilinguality together with appropriate subject-matter achievement.

Overview. My reason for drawing attention to these three very different approaches has been to indicate that systematic needs assessment/goals specification and policy implementation has occurred in many parts of the world. In the three examples that I have chosen, a number of critical attributes vary; the role and status of the languages in question; the presence or absence of a rich literary tradition in the language(s) in question; the availability of appropriate materials in the target language; the availability of trained teachers who are mother tongue speakers or fluently bilingual speakers of a particular target language(s); parental and community expectations concerning the educational chances and choices available to the youngsters, etc.

On the basis of these three, and indeed many other case studies, it is apparent that no single, simple recommendation concerning the choice or sequencing of languages as media for educational instruction can be made that will suffice for children in all settings. The available evidence indicates that a variety of factors -- individual, social, and pedagogical -- interact in unique ways in diverse settings to influence students' ultimate levels of language development and academic achievement. On the one hand, introducing children to education in their native language before exposing them to instruction via a second language appears to be successful and desirable in many countries. Bilingual education in such circumstances should include a carefully designed native language arts

program integrated in a general curriculum which uses the children's native language for basic subject matter instruction and which adds a second language to the child's repertoire at some point not only as a subject for study but, for at least some portion of the day, as a medium of instruction thereby leading to additive bilingualism (Lambert, 1980). On the other hand, educating children initially exclusively through a second language and subsequently through both the native and second languages is feasible and effective in settings where the native language of the children is the majority language of the society at large, where maintenance of the native language is desired, and where parents and educators actively encourage literacy in the native language. This type of bilingual education has been shown to lead the high levels of second language competence for children in these settings without loss of language proficiency or academic achievement. Because of the diverse that characterize bilingual education, a systematic evaluation -- both formative and summative -- is an important, integral part of each program.

Implications for U. S. Educators. Despite recent findings, however, bilingual education programs will not succeed unless they are also consistent with national policy -- whether explicit or implicit -- and with the clearly expressed goals of local education authorities. Indeed it is apparent that social and political pressures motivated by diverse factors have led to innovative experiments in bilingual education, whereas the results of empirical research alone rarely have. This is not surprising since the selection in a particular country, province, or city of the language(s) to be taught or to be used as a medium of instruction clearly constitutes an important aspect of educational, and therefore, of national planning. What I have suggested is that innovative language education should be viewed as a special case of language planning. It is important to define goals or objectives as carefully as possible. There are various options or models available for consideration. If the goal is to develop the fullest possible degree of "language competence" among American students then some form of bilingual education program would appear to be both feasible and desirable. In particular, programs now referred to as two-way, bilingual immersion, interlocking bilingual or developmental bilingual education programs may be extremely exciting. Whatever approach is chosen, there is a need for continuing formative feedback to help inform and fine tune language policy and language practice. Such research has been noticeably lacking in

many American school districts (but see Lindholm & Padilla, forthcoming and Rhodes, Crandall & Christian, forthcoming).

A word about demographics. A recent article in The Washington Post (October 11, 1987) cites demographic statistics which indicate that while the population of school-age children in public schools decreased by approximately eight million students between 1970 and 1985, the percentage of minority students increased from 24% in 1976 to 28.8% in 1984. Moreover, this percentage is projected by the Department of Education to increase to 38.4% by the year 2000. By 1981, in states such as California, New Mexico and Texas, the percentage of minority students exceeded 35%, and the percentage in Florida, Illinois, and New York was nearing 35% as well. Unfortunately, academic achievement and school completion rates for many minority students -- particularly Hispanic students, who are the largest minority and the fastest growing sector of our population -- are woefully low. In the Southwest, Rendon (1983) reports that 40% of the Hispanic students drop out by 10th grade, and an additional 10% drop out before graduation. Of those who do graduate, only a small percentage attend college and the majority of those who do choose community colleges. Of those who attend four-year colleges, the majority study education, business, or social science. Less than 3% of the science, math and technical majors are Hispanic. By the year 2000, the nation will have a smaller pool of potential workers and college students, and the people in this pool will be less prepared for work and college study due to circumstances such as poverty, unstable homes, and lack of English language skills.

While these statistics document a problem for all minority groups -- particularly Hispanic and Black children -- language minorities, i.e., those for whom English is not the native language, are notably at risk. Due to a combination of migration patterns and family size, the fastest growing population in the United States is the language minority population. Almost one million refugees entered the United States betwen 1975 and 1985. The majority (650,000) arrived from Southeast Asia, but substantial numbers came from Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, the Caribbean, Africa, and the Middle East. Added to these numbers are the several million undocumented aliens who arrived from Central America and the Caribbean. Moreover, both racial and ethnic minority families, particularly Black and Hispanic, are characteristically larger than those of the American

majority population. If current trends continue, we can expect that 53 of the major American cities will have a minority language population as a majority of the student body by the year 2000.

What types of programs are available for language-minority youngsters? Let me greatly oversimplify the situation by noting:

1. That some enroll in bilingual educational programs (particularly transitional bilingual programs) where they get some of their education in their native language while they are learning enough English to be mainstreamed;

2. That others take English as a second language (ESL) or English tutorials while they are also taking some content classes taught in English; or

3. Finally that still others are submerged in an all English-speaking classroom, with the hope that they will finally somehow make sense of both the English and the academic content being taught.

With respect to transitional bilingual education programs, this approach in principle involves the use of the mother tongue for initial literacy training and content instruction together with an ESL component that would lead to a gradual transition to all English instruction. In academic year 1986-1987, approximately 170,000 limited English proficient (LEP) children were served with Title VII funds; 725,000 with state funds; 390,000 with other funds; and 690,000 with local funds. The General Accounting Office (GAO) in a recent review reported that there was little available information on the amount of native language instruction within TBE programs, but they did document that English was used predominantly in two careful case studies to which they had access (the SBIF study, and that recently conducted by Development Associates). In fact, it was concluded that many so-called exemplary/demonstration bilingual programs really do not provide bilingual education at all.

There is a growing consensus concerning the desirable characteristics of an exemplary program. Let me give the example of a hypothetical group of youngsters homogeneous by mother tongue (e.g., Spanish) who might begin school in which there would be a native language arts component, a native language literacy component, and teaching of content material via the native language. In addition, from the beginning there would be an ESL strand, and ideally one in which

the curriculum model for the ESL strand was a content-based curriculum. This plan would continue for from four to six years with the content-based language instruction gradually increasing so that over the course of four to six years while the native language would continue to be used as a principle medium of instruction, the amount of English language instruction would also increase. This is, of course, almost never the case at present.

We might also note that teachers should be proficient speakers of the target language(s), that they should be well trained, that support services such as counseling and remediation should be available; that library and other resources should be available and that there should be active parental involvement. There should, thus, be an attempt to facilitate additive bilingualism. What might one expect the results of such a program to be? Willig (1985) in her careful review of available evidence concludes "Participation in bilingual education programs consistently produced small to moderate differences favoring (emphases mine) bilingual education for tests of reading, language skills, math and total achievement -- even when the tests were in English."

What are some of the problems which I see at the moment? There still exists a scarcity of trained teachers, typically too few years are devoted to bilingual education, typically there is a lack of material in many languages other than Spanish, etc. There is also a notable lack of communication among mainstream teachers, bilingual education teachers, special education teachers and resource people.

Increasingly, I have become interested in programs intended to improve language and subject matter achievement opportunities for both language minority and language majority youngsters. Such programs are developing in many parts of the country and have come to be referred to as interlocking, two-way, or bilingual immersion programs (Lindholm, 1987). The characteristics of such a program might be the following: imagine a situation in which at grade 1 there were 15 Anglo youngsters and 15 Hispanic youngsters. They would be grouped in a class with some portion of the day devoted to Spanish language arts (for the Hispanics), Spanish as a second language (for the Anglos), English language arts (for the Anglos), English as a Second Language (for the Hispanics), and teaching of some of the content material in English and other in Spanish with the opportunity for cooperative learning, peer group tutoring, modeling, etc. The idea is to

develop a bilingual ambiance in which representatives of both of the major ethnolinguistic groups have an opportunity to develop and hone their literacy skills while acquiring the fullest possible proficiency in a second language. Such programs are now actively underway in California, Maryland, Virginia and New York state to name but a few places, and the results are indeed very positive (see Tucker and Crandall, 1989). All too often in any type of educational program involving language innovation the amount of time devoted to the task is seriously underestimated. From my perspective, it is sobering to note that it can take from five to seven years for children to learn the academic language skills which will enable them to compete in solving math problems, doing science experiments, analyzing the causes or effects of a particular historical event, or writing a comparative essay (Collier, 1987). The task of educating youngsters in their own, let alone another, language is not a trivial one. Clearly one must devote additional resources to doing so.

Conclusion. Why should we be concerned with imporving the quality of language education programs for all American youngsters? Domestically, our country is rapidly and drastically changing in terms of demography. The composition and needs of our workforce are changing, and the demands on our children and young adults to develop problem-solving and decision-making skills is absolutely critical. Isn't it interesting that we find that those who develop bilingual proficiency consistently out-perform their monolingual counterparts in terms of creativity and problem-solving? Internationally if we are to compete effectively, we must communicate more effectively in English and in the languages of our clients, our trading partners, and our allies. It is my opinion that we must take steps immediately, rapidly, and increasingly to broaden the base of additive bilingualism in our society because there are cognitive, personal, social and economic benefits that will accrue when we do so. It should be viewed as unacceptable that so few youngsters, and so few young adults in the United States develop bilingual language proficiency or have an opportunity to do so as is now the case. It is not acceptable that fewer than 1% of our youngsters or young adults study or master foreign languages which are spoken by 99% of the world's population. It is not acceptable that the development of a language competent Ameican society should be accorded such a low priority. One of the ways to do this is to critically examine

our social needs and objectives and to use the tools of language education planning to implement a language education program which will benefit all American youngsters.

References

Collier, V.P. (1987). Age and rate of acquisition of second language for academic purposes. TESOL Quarterly, 21, 617-641.

Cziko, G. A. & Troike, R. C. (1984). Contexts of bilingual education: international perspectives and issues. In R. Bugarski (Ed.) AILA Review, 1, 7-33.

Genesee, F. (1987). Learning Through Two Languages: Studies of Immersion and Bilingual Education. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Lambert, W. E. (1980). The Two Faces of Bilingual Education. NCBE Forum, 3.

Language Education in Africa. (1985). Seminar Proceedings No. 26. Center of African Studies. Edinburgh, Scotland.

Lindholm, K. (1987). Directory of bilingual immersion programs: two-way bilingual education for language-minority and language-majority students. (Educational Report 9). Los Angeles: University of California, Center for Language Education and Research.

Linguistic Society of the Philippines (September 1986). Eleven Years of Bilingual Schooling in the Philippines (1974-1985): A Summative Evaluation. Mimeographed report.

Sibayan, B.P. (1978). Bilingual Education in the Philippines: Strategy and Structure. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.) International Dimensions of Bilingual Education. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1978. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Tucker, G. R. (1977). Some observations concerning bilingualism and second-language teaching in developing countries and in North America. In P. A. Hornby (Ed.) Bilingualism: Psychological, Social and Educational Implications. New York: Academic Press.

Tucker, G. R. (1987). Educational language policy in the Philippines: a case study. In P. Lowenberg (Ed.) Language Spread and Language Policy: Issues, Implications and Case Studies. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1987. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Tucker, G.R. & Crandall, J.A. (1989). The integration of language and content instruction for language minority and language majority youngsters. In J.E. Alatis (Ed.) Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1989. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Weinstein, B. (1983). The Civic Tongue: Political Consequences of Language Choices. New York: Longman.

Willig, A. C. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. Review of Educational Research, 55, 269-317.